

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
8425 SEASONS PARKWAY, SUITE 105
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55125
TEL 651.735-1100
FAX 651.735-1102
WWW.SSIPLAW.COM

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 25 2003

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	Examiner Daniel J. Chung	FROM:	Steven J. Shumaker
COMPANY:	USPTO - Group Art Unit 2600	DATE:	SEPTEMBER 23, 2003
FAX NUMBER:	703-872-9315	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:	6
PHONE NUMBER:	703-872-9313	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:	1037-044US04
RE:	Terminal Disclaimer	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:	09/536,366

OFFICIAL

☐ URGENT ☒ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY

NOTES/COMMENTS:

copy

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Christopher J. Edge, Examiner: Daniel J. Chung
Timothy A. Fischer and
William A. Rozzi

Serial No.: 09/536,366 Group Art Unit: 2672

Filed: March 27, 2000 Docket No.: 1037-044US04

Title: COLOR MAPPING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited via facsimile with the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on September 23, 2003.

By:

Angela Watson

Name: Angela Watson

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 25 2003

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the final Office Action mailed March 26, 2002, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks and the Terminal Disclaimer filed concurrently herewith. Applicants filed a Notice of Appeal in this application on June 26, 2003. An Appeal Brief is due September 26, 2003, i.e., within the statutory period of response to the final Office Action mailed March 26, 2002.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 25, 28-29, 31-33, 35-38, 41 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,081) in view of Sakuyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,595), and further in view of Shu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,843), and rejected claims 26-27, 30, 34, 39-40, 42, 43, 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swen et al., Sakuyama et al., and Shu et al., and further in view of Rozzi (U.S. Patent No. 6,232,954). The Examiner also rejected claims 25, 32-33, 38 and 41 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 10, 13, 18, 37, 41, 45-47 of U.S. No. 6,088,038.

OFFICIAL